

For Newsweek, 520

LEO SZILARD

4 April 1962

What Russia wants is far-reaching disarmament which would permit her to solve her domestic economic problems and to extend her influence in the world by giving aid to under-developed nations on an unprecedented scale. We as a nation have not made up our minds whether we would want <sup>such</sup> far-reaching disarmament even if Russia were to accept adequate inspection.

In a disarmed world we could not live up to our present commitments militarily to defend countries which lie in the geographical proximity of Russia or China. It follows that disarmament would be politically acceptable to us only if there were a political settlement which would permit us to free ourselves from our present commitments without loss of prestige and without sacrificing the security of the other nations involved. Because the Russians want disarmament very much they may be expected to pay a commensurate price for obtaining it and they might agree to the kind of political settlement that would be needed.

This, however, is not enough. Disarmament does not automatically guarantee peace and in a disarmed world, even with the inspection going ~~at~~ full-blast, armies equipped with machine guns could spring up, so to speak, over night.

The Administration cannot negotiate with Russia in earnest any substantial advance towards disarmament until it knows whether it wants to have general disarmament and it will not know this until America and Russia first reach a meeting of the minds on the ~~peace~~ issue of how the peace may be secured in a disarmed world. To this date ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> one within the Administration has given serious thought to this issue. ~~Up to now~~ <sup>is</sup> the pat American answer ~~is~~ that 'yes, we want disarmament provided that there is set-up an International Armed Force, so strong that no nation could possibly resist it, ~~is~~ <sup>and this</sup> tantamount to saying that we don't want disarmament <sup>for</sup> it would be physically impossible to set-up an international armed force so strong that neither America or Russia could resist it, unless it were made the sole possessor of atomic bombs -- ~~a solution~~ which would not be acceptable either to Russia or to America.

Perhaps it is asking too much ~~to ask~~ <sup>that</sup> the Administration ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> assume ~~the~~ <sup>intellectual</sup> leadership on the issue of disarmament and ~~progress~~ <sup>may be</sup> will have to come through private initiative. ~~First, what we ought to do is to~~ <sup>Perhaps</sup> ~~set up~~ <sup>What needs to be done is to</sup> a privately initiated joint American ~~and~~ Russian staff study of ~~the issue of how one may secure peace in a disarmed world.~~ <sup>under private sponsorship a</sup> Such a study would be aimed at producing a working paper that would list the various solutions of the problem and discuss in the case of each particular solution in what circumstances it would be likely to fail. Such a joint study would have the advantage that none of the alternatives discussed would be tagged in advance either as an American or Russian proposal and being free from this stigma could be objectively appraised by the governments involved.

LEO SZILARD

4 April

*this logic*  
If an acceptable solution of ~~the peace~~ problem were in sight and we were in a position to propose to Russia far-reaching disarmament -- disarmament might ~~be~~ <sup>turn out</sup> ~~prove~~ to be the key that would open the door to an acceptable post-war settlement. For disarmament is what Russia *really* wants and it might be possible successfully to negotiate with Russia *for once* if ~~we are able to~~ <sup>we are able to</sup> offer her something that she wants.